

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/820,447 | Applicant(s) LEE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Rudy Zervigon | Art Unit 1763 | |

All Participants:

(1) Rudy Zervigon.

(2) M. Mathews Hall.
Status of Application: ____

(3) ____

(4) ____

Date of Interview: 4 September 2006
Time: 15:03
Type of Interview:


- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
All pending
Claims discussed:
All pending
Prior art documents discussed:
None
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
I called Mr. Hall to inquire on the disposition of the case. Mr. Hall confirmed that Applicant's had not provided any additional instructions for Mr. Hall in response to the March 2, 2006 rejection. Mr. Hall presumes the case abandoned as a result.
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)